



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,366	09/30/2003	Susan D. Woolf	4110	3219

7590 05/04/2007
Law Offices of Albert S. Michalik, PLLC
Suite 193
704-228th Avenue NE
Sammamish, WA 98074

EXAMINER

HUYNH, THU V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/04/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/676,366

Applicant(s)

WOOLF ET AL.

Examiner

Thu V. Huynh

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE and amendment filed on 12/04/06 to application filed on 09/30/03, which has the benefit of prior provisional filed on 05/19/03.
2. Claims 2, 29-30 are canceled. Claims 35-37 are added
3. Claims 1, 3-28, 31-37 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 13, 31, 35 are independent claims.
4. The rejections of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter, have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.
5. The rejections of claims 1, 2, 5-6, 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)
6. as being unpatentable over Martin, US 5,909,213, filed 11/28/97 in view of Barsness et al., US 2004/0201633 A1, filed 09/13/01, have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.
7. The rejections of claims 3-4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin in view of Barsness as applied to claims 1 and 10, and further in view of McArdle et al., US 5,859,974, filed 07/08/06, have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

The rejections of claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin in view of Barsness as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Rothrock et al., US 5,729,687, filed 12/20/93, have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Art Unit: 2178

8. The rejection of claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chastain et al., US 2003/0009459 A1, filed 07/06/01, in view of Altman, US 2004/0163042 A1, filed 02/17/04, has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.
9. The rejection of claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chastain in view of Altman as applied to claim 29 above and further in view of Bose et al., US 2002/0042830 A1, filed 04/02/01, has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.
10. The rejections of claims 29-30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gupta et al., US 6,484,156 B1, filed 1999, have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

12. **Claims 1, 3-13, 15, 17, 21-23, 26-28, 31-32 and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hendriks et al., US 2003/0163525 A1, filed 02/22/02.**

Regarding independent claim 1, Hendriks teaches the steps of:

- an act of receiving annotation data from a first user among the plurality of computer users (Hendriks; fig.3, [0032], [0038]; public handwritten annotations from clients are written into text or private field and sends to a server for distributing to be displayed in an area so that other clients can view such handwritten annotations);
- an act of determining that handwritten annotation data is public data (Hendriks; fig.3, [0032], [0038]; determining the handwritten annotations is public data to send to other clients);
- an act of automatically writing the handwritten annotation data of the first user to a shared canvas in response to the determination that the handwritten annotation data is public data, the shared canvas for sharing handwritten annotation received from any of the plurality of users with any other of the plurality of users such that handwritten annotations appear to be written on a common display surface shared among the plurality of users (Hendriks; fig.3; [0031], [0035], message(s)/ handwritten annotation(s) are written into an shared area and sent to clients who joined the same instant message (IM) topic of interest).
- an act of distributing the shared canvas, including any shared handwritten annotations, to at least one device of at least one recipient subscriber (Hendriks; fig.3; [0031], [0035], sending message(s)/ handwritten annotation(s) to clients for viewing such annotations).

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Hendriks teaches combining the annotation data with other annotation data on a graffiti page (Hendriks, [0032], [0038]; entered annotations from clients are combined, published and shared with other register client).

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Hendriks teaches the shared canvas corresponds to a page of a publication, and wherein receiving annotation data comprises receiving annotation corresponding to the page (Hendriks, [0032], [0038]; entered annotations from clients are combined shared with other register client, wherein the annotations are received from the public record field).

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Hendriks teaches wherein distributing the annotation data to at least one recipient subscriber comprises combining the annotation data with other annotation data on a graffiti page (Hendriks, [0032], [0038]; entered annotations from are combined shared with other register client).

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent on claim 5, Hendriks teaches receiving annotation independent of any page of a publication (Hendriks, [0032]; receiving annotations in private area).

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Hendriks teaches accessing a list of subscriber users, and sending the annotation data to at least one subscriber user in

Art Unit: 2178

the list (Hendriks, [0031], [0035]; sending annotations based on a list of registered clients).

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Hendriks teaches automatically updating a subscriber (Hendriks, [0031]; client registers to join an interested session in real time)

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 7, Hendriks teaches receiving a request from a computing device corresponding to a subscriber user, and wherein sending the annotation data comprises providing the annotation data in response to the request (Hendriks, [0050], client sends request sending annotations based on timeline).

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Hendriks teaches persisting the annotation data (Hendrik, [0050]; persisting annotations for searching).

Regarding claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, Hendriks teaches receiving data corresponding to a page of a publication, and wherein persisting the annotation data comprises persisting the annotation data in association with the page (Hendriks, [0045],[0051]; linking annotations with current session record).

Claim 12 is for a computer storage medium having computer executable instructions performing the method of claim 1 and is rejected under the same rationale (In

order to perform the steps of receiving and distributing the annotation data of claim 1 in a computer conference system, executable instructions must stored in the computer).

Regarding independent claim 13, Hendriks teaches the steps of:

- an annotation device that is a client of the server, the annotation device including an annotation program that manages handwritten annotations input by first client that is among the plurality of clients and includes at least one operating mode configured to write the handwritten annotation data of the first client to a shared canvas in response to a determination that the handwritten annotation data is public data, the shared canvas for sharing handwritten annotations received from any of the plurality of client with any other of the plurality of clients such that handwritten annotations appear to be written on a common display surface shared among the plurality of clients handwritten annotations (Hendriks; fig.3, [0032], [0038]; public handwritten annotations from clients are written into a layer of public recording field and sends to a server for distributing to be displayed in an area so that other clients can view such handwritten annotations; “Annotations entered in the recording field are public and distributed to all users”); and
- a send mechanism that sends the shared canvas, including any shared handwritten annotations to a server for distribution to at least some of the plurality of clients, the shared handwritten annotations identified as public and selectively published to at least one client and not published to at least on other client (Hendriks; fig.3; [0031], [0035], message(s)/annotation(s) are sent

to clients who joined the same instant message (IM) topic of interest and not sent to other clients who joined to different IM session).

Regarding claim 15, which is dependent on claim 13, Hendriks teaches the annotation program displays a page of a publication, and wherein the handwritten annotations are receive in association with the displayed (Hendriks, figure 3 and 6; [0031]-[0032]; client annotates the document image in parallel with the display of predefined form in public field 1, wherein the predefined form is one page form).

Regarding claim 17, which is dependent on claim 15, Hendriks teaches the annotations program includes at least one other operating mode in which received handwritten annotations are private (Hendriks, fig.3, [0032], private ink area, such as input field 15 for previewing handwritten strokes).

Regarding claim 21, which is dependent on claim 13, Hendriks teaches wherein one operating mode in which received handwritten annotations are to be published comprises a graffiti page canvas mode in which annotations are distributed by the server to any other client (Hendriks, fig.6, [0032], [0035], [0038]; ink annotations entered in public record field 1 are distributed by the server to any other client).

Regarding claim 22, which is dependent on claim 13, Hendriks teaches the annotation device includes a receive mechanism that receives handwritten annotations published by at least one other client and provides those annotations to the annotation

Art Unit: 2178

program for presentation (Hendriks, [0035], [0048], [0039]; server receives the annotations from a user and distributes to other user's computer for viewing and/or annotation).

Regarding claim 23, which is dependent on claim 21, Hendriks teaches the annotations device combines the received published handwritten annotations with the handwritten annotations input by the author for displaying to that author (Hendriks, fig.3; [0035], [0048], [0039]; a user selects a published annotation to add new annotations on public filed 1, which is displayed on user computer).

Regarding claim 26, which is dependent on claim 13, Hendriks teaches the received handwritten annotations correspond to a graffiti mode in which any client receives data from any publisher that is operating in the graffiti mode (Hendriks, [0032], [0035]; ink annotations entered from any author in public record field 1 of a session are distributed by the server to any other client who joined in the session).

Regarding claim 27, which is dependent on claim 13, Hendriks teaches the annotation device further comprises a mechanism for subscribing to receive the public handwritten annotations of another user (Hendriks, [0031], the user joins to interest group).

Regarding claim 28, which is dependent on claim 13, Hendriks teaches the annotation device further comprises a mechanism for filtering which annotations are

presented (Hendriks, fig.3, “Search” button; [0050]; searching annotations based on timeline and content)

Regarding independent claim 31, Hendriks teaches the steps of:

- a first annotation device having a first annotation program thereon on which a first client among a plurality of client inputs handwritten annotation data and which writes the handwritten annotation data of the first client to a shared canvas in response to a determination that the handwritten annotation data is semi-public data, the shared canvas for sharing handwritten annotations received from any of the plurality of clients with any other of the plurality of client such that handwritten annotations appear to be written on a common display surface shared among the plurality of clients, the handwritten annotation data selectively published to at least one client and not published to at least one other client among the plurality of clients (Hendriks; fig.3, [0031], [0032], [0038]; a client inputs ink annotations into public recording field 1 and sends to a server for distributing to other clients; “Annotations entered in the recording field are public and distributed to all users” who joined the same instant message (IM) topic of interest and not sent to other clients who joined to different IM session);
- a second annotation device having a second annotation program thereon which outputs handwritten annotation data (Hendriks; fig.3; [0032], [0035], each participant is able to annotate in recording field and press “ “Send”

Art Unit: 2178

button cause the input to be sent to the server for distribution among session participants” for viewing and annotation);

- a server that receives the semi-public handwritten annotation data from the first annotation device and sends the shared canvas, including any shared semi-public annotation data to the second annotation device for output via the second annotation program (Hendriks; fig.3; [0031], [0035], “ “Send” button cause the input to be sent to the server for distribution among session participants”).

Regarding claim 32, which is dependent on claim 31, Hendriks teaches the first annotation program outputs annotation data, the second annotation program inputs other public annotation data, and wherein the server receives the other public handwritten annotation data from the second annotation device and send the other public handwritten annotation data to the first annotation device for output via the first annotation program (Hendriks; fig.3; [0032], [0035], each participant is able to annotate in recording field and press “ “Send” button cause the input to be sent to the server for distribution among session participants”).

Regarding independent claim 35, Hendriks teaches the steps of:

- an act of an annotation program receiving from a computer user handwritten annotation data for sharing via a shared canvas, the shared canvas for sharing handwritten annotations received from any of the plurality of client with any other of the plurality of clients such that handwritten annotations appear to be

written on a common display surface shared among the plurality of clients handwritten annotations (Hendriks; fig.3, [0032], [0038]; public handwritten annotations from clients are written into a layer of public recording field and sends to a server for distributing to be displayed in an area so that other clients can view such handwritten annotations; “Annotations entered in the recording field are public and distributed to all users”); and

- an act of sending the handwritten annotation data to a server for combining with other handwritten annotation data on a shared canvas in response to determination that the handwritten annotation data is public data (Hendriks; fig.3; [0031], [0035], message(s)/annotation(s) are sent to clients who joined the same instant message (IM) topic of interest).
- an act of a computer user receiving from the server an updated shared canvas including handwritten annotation data entered by other computer users of the plurality of computer users (Hendriks; fig.3; [0031], [0035], updating handwritten annotation(s) are sent to clients who joined the same instant message (IM) topic of interest).

Regarding claim 36, which is dependent on claim 31, Hendriks teaches using a time-based filter to limit the annotations displayed with the document on the shared canvas to those annotations input before a certain time or date (Hendriks, [0050], displaying handwritten annotation based on timeline).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 37, which is dependent on claim 31, Hendriks teaches using an author-based filter to limit the annotations displayed with the document on the shared canvas to those annotations input by one or more specified users (Hendriks, [0033]; status of clients, such as “I am logged in” or “Do not disturb” to limit the annotations to clients based on the client’s status)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

14. **Claims 14 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendriks as applied to claims 13 and 31 above, and further in view of Hendler et al., US 2002/0042833 A1, filed 12/29/00.**

Regarding claim 14, which is dependent on claim 13, Hendriks does not explicitly teach the send mechanism comprises a background send thread of the annotation device.

Hendler teaches background process/thread is used to send data to a server while client computer is executing another process (Hendler, [0087]; “while the client computer 410 is executing a first module, a background process may send control data 415 to a server”).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hendler’s teaching and Hendrik’s teaching to include a background thread/process to send data (annotation) to the server, since the combination would have allowed the user to interact with annotation program while sending annotations, such as instead of waiting sending process is completed in order to write another annotation, the user is able to write another annotation while sending a previous annotation.

Regarding claim 33, which is dependent on claim 31, Hendriks teaches the first annotation device sends the public annotation data to the server (Hendriks, [0035]). However, Eintracht does not explicitly teach *a background thread* is used to send the annotation to the server.

Hendler teaches background process/thread is used to send data to a server while client computer is executing another process (Hendler, [0087]; “while the client computer 410 is executing a first module, a background process may send control data 415 to a server”).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hendler's teaching and Hendriks' teaching to include a background thread/process, since the combination would have allowed the user to interact with annotation program while sending annotations, such as instead of waiting sending process is completed in order to write another annotation, the user is able to write another annotation while sending a previous annotation.

15. Claims 16, 19, 20 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendriks as applied to claims 13 and 15 above, and further in view of Rothrock et al., US 5,729,687, filed 12/20/93.

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, Hendriks teaches wherein the send mechanism provides an identity of the author and ink data corresponding to the ink annotations to the server (Hendriks, figures 5A, 5B and 5C, "Bob's annotation ink", "The house Bob circled" and "Bob's annotation stroke data" are sent to server in order to distributing to other clients).

However, Hendriks does not explicitly disclose sending an identifier of the page of the publication to the server.

Rothrock teaches page identifier is used in a page list to provide annotation when the user request for viewing or manipulating (Rothrock, col.7, lines 54-67 and col.8, lines 13-23; conference participant requests for viewing or manipulate the annotation information in particular page using page list which contains page identifiers).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Rothrock's teaching and Hendriks' teaching to

Art Unit: 2178

send the page identifiers of a publication or form for storing in the server, since the combination would have allowed the user to retrieve annotations based on each page of the form or publication to distribute to the user.

Regarding claim 19, which is dependent on claim 13, Hendriks teaches one operating mode in which received ink annotations are to be published comprises a presentation in which annotations are distributed by the server to subscriber (Hendriks, figure 3 and 6; [0031]-[0032]; client annotates the document image in parallel with the display of a predefined form in public field 1. The annotations are distributed to a group of users by the server). However, Hendriks does not explicitly teach a presentation page notation mode.

Rothrock teaches one operating mode in which received annotations are to be published comprises a presentation page notation mode in which annotations are distributed to subscriber (Rothrock, col.7, lines 54-67; col.7, lines 54-67 and col.8, lines 13-23; conference participant requests for viewing or manipulate the annotation information in particular page using page list which contains page identifiers).

Regarding claim 20, which is dependent on claim 13, Hendriks does not disclose wherein one operating mode in which received ink annotations are to be published comprises a shared canvas mode corresponding to a publication page in which annotations are distributed by the server to any other client in association with that publication page.

Rothrock teaches wherein one operating mode in which received ink annotations are to be published comprises a shared canvas mode corresponding to a publication page in which annotations are distributed to any other client in association with that publication page (Rothrock, col.7, lines 54-67; col.7, lines 54-67 and col.8, lines 13-23; entered annotations from users in plurality pages in application public workspace are combined, displayed and shared with other conference participants by per-page corresponding to a page being presented).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Rothrock's teaching and Hendriks' teaching to annotate on a shared canvas, since the combination would have provided one page per conference as well as plurality of pages per conference to share annotations among conference participants.

Regarding claim 25, which is dependent on claim 13, Hendriks does not teach the received annotations correspond to a shared canvas mode in which any client receives data from any other annotations publisher in association with a publication page.

Rothrock teaches the received annotations correspond to a shared canvas mode in which any client receives data from any other annotations publisher in association with a publication page (Rothrock, col.7, lines 54-67; col.7, lines 54-67 and col.8, lines 13-23; entered annotations from users in plurality pages in application public workspace are combined, displayed and shared with other conference participants by per-page corresponding to a page being presented).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Rothrock's teaching and Hendriks' teaching to annotate on a shared canvas, since the combination would have provided one page per conference as well as plurality of pages per conference to share annotations among conference participants.

16. **Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendriks as applied to claim 13 above and further in view of Kloubakov et al., US 2002/0103708 A1, filed 01/30/02.**

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent on claim 13, Hendriks does not teach the annotations program provides at least one warning to the author when the operating mode is one in which the input ink annotations are to be published.

Kloubakov teaches different user interface modes are available for a user to activate and a visual indicator tells the user that particular user interface mode is activate (Kloubakov, [007]-[0008]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Kloubakov's teaching and Hendriks' teaching to provide a visual indicator for public and/or private field when such field is activate, since the combination would have indicated the user what field the annotation is entered.

17. **Claims 24 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendriks as applied to claim 21 above and further in view of Nakai et al., US 6,170,016 B1, filed 12/09/98.**

Regarding claim 24, which is dependent on claim 21, Hendriks does not explicitly teach the receive mechanism comprises a background receive thread.

Nakai teaches background process/thread is used to receive data in (Nakai, col.3, lines 44-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Nakai's teaching and Hendrik's teaching to include a background thread/process to receive data (annotation) from the server, since the combination would have allowed the user to interact with annotation program while receive annotations, such as instead of waiting receiving process is completed in order to write another annotation, the user is able to write another annotation while receiving a annotation from other user.

Regarding claim 34, which is dependent on claim 31, Hendriks teaches a process on the second annotation device that receives the public annotation data from the server (Hendriks, [0035], participant's device receives annotation). However, Hendriks does not explicitly teach *a background thread* is used to receive the annotation from the server.

Nakai teaches background process/thread is used to receive data (Nakai, col.3, lines 44-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Nakai's teaching and Hendriks' teaching to include a background thread/process to receive data (annotation) from the server, since the combination would have allowed the user to interact with annotation program while

Art Unit: 2178

receive annotations, such as instead of waiting receiving process is completed in order to write another annotation, the user is able to write another annotation while receiving a annotation from other user.

Response to Arguments

18. Applicant's arguments filed on 06/29/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that “neither Hendriks, Gupta, Martin nor Barsness teach or suggest automatically writing the handwritten annotation data of the first user to a shared canvas in response to the determination that the handwritten annotation data is public data, the shared canvas for sharing handwritten annotations received from any of the plurality of user with any other of the plurality of users such that handwritten annotations appear to be written on a common display surface shared among the plurality of users. Furthermore, neither Hendriks, Gupta, Martin nor Barsness teach or suggest distributing the shared canvas, including any shared handwritten annotations, to at least one device of at least one recipient subscriber” (Remarks, pages 11-12).

This is not persuasive. Hendriks teaches users input handwritten annotation(s) in text field or private field; identifying such annotations are public data so that such annotations are sent and shared among plurality of users (Hendriks, [0032]). Therefore, Hendriks’ teaching is still met the claimed language.

Conclusion

19. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

Art Unit: 2178

applicant's disclosure.

Gupta, US 2001/0042098 A1, filed 1999, teaches facilitating annotation creation and notification via electronic.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu V. Huynh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Thu V. Huynh
March 5, 2007